UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,941	05/08/2002	Peter Christoffel Bezuijen	2001-1003	8756

466	7590	09/29/2005

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER
WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/019,941	BEZUIJEN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Leslie Wong	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 July 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 May 2002</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 08 July 2005, is acknowledged.

Specification

2.   Applicants' amendments, submitted on 08 July 2005, overcome Specification

objections. Examiner hereby withdrawn the objections that were given in the Office Action

dated 06 March 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were

made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37

CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not

commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior

art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   Claims 1-4, 12, 13-16, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Uhl et al.** ("Uhl") (U.S. Patent 6,292,709 B1) in view of **Higgins et al.**

("Higgins")(US 5,754,671 A).

        Regarding claims 1, 13, and 25-26, **Uhl** teaches installation and method for

updating an address database with recorded address records, comprising:

        a).   at least one processor (14, 15, 42) for receiving and processing address

data as shown on items of post (col.1, lines 10-14 and Fig. 6);

        b).   a memory (22), connected to the at least one processor (14, 15, 42) for

storing the address data (col. 6, lines 1-7 and Fig. 6);

        c).   a database memory 944), connected to the at least one processor (14, 15,

42), containing the address database stored therein (col. 5, lines 59-62; and col. 6, lines 1-

6 and Fig. 6) characterized in that

        d).   the at least one processor (14, 15, 42) is equipped to compare the address

data with the address records stored in the database memory (44) and to update the

content of the database memory (44) on the basis of the comparison of the address data

with the stored address records (col. 5, lines 50-62, col. 6, lines 41-44 and 53-55 and

abstract).

        Uhl does not explicitly teach determining a quality rating for the address data on

the basis of predefined criteria, the quality rating indicating how good the address data

are.

        Higgins, however, teaches determining a quality rating for the address data on the

basis of predefined criteria, **quality rating** indicating how good the address data are as for

each normalized character image, the character recognition process produces 9 choices plus their respective confidence values. Confidence values are distance measure from the ideal that ranges from 1-255, with 1 being the highest confidence (col. 4, lines 24-28). The candidates are then ranked based on the sum of the character confidence values for the individual characters of the three-digit zip codes. The three-digit zip code with the highest confidence value sum is then assumed to be the correct choice for that image (col. 7, lines 41-45; col. 5, lines 44-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Higgins's** teaching would have allowed **Uhl's** to facilitate selection of the correct choice for the image by providing ranking for the candidates based on the sum of the character confidence values for the individual characters of the three-digit zip codes as suggested by **Higgins** at (col. 7, lines 41-45).

Regarding claims 2-4 and 14-16, **Uhl** further teaches wherein the at least one processor is equipped to select name lines from the address data to split the names lines into individual elements in accordance with predefined rules and partly to base the quality rating on the selection of name lines and the splitting thereof (col. 4, lines 8-19 and col. 5 lines 50-62).

Regarding claims 12 and 24, **Uhl** further teaches wherein post sorting unit (26, 28) for automatic sorting of the items of post (1) making use of the address database (col. 9, lines 36-52).

5.   Claims 5-10 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Uhl et al.** ("Uhl") (U.S. Patent 6,292,709 B1) in view of **Higgins et al.** ("Higgins")(US 5,754,671 A) as applied to claims 1-4, 12, 13-16, and 24-26 in view of **Byrd, Jr. et al.** ("Byrd") (U.S. Patent 5,832,480).

Regarding claims 5 and 17, **Uhl** further teaches wherein the at least one processor is equipped to derive a name for an addressee from the name lines, to derive an address for the addressee form the address data, to read registered names of persons residing at the address from the address database and to compare theses with the name of the addressee (col. 2, lines 34-36).

Uhl and Higgins do not explicitly teach on the basis of that comparison, to determine a comparison score per registered name, a comparison score having a higher value the greater the degree of correspondence between the name of the addressee and a respective registered name.

Byrd, however, teaches the equivalence processor scans the list of name elements until it finds a name element with a high confidence score for a given entity type. The entity-type check processes results in a certain confidence score. If the confidence score is high enough, the entity type is assigned to the name element and the values of the relevant attributes are set (col. 18, lines 15-18; col. 15, lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Byrd's** teaching would have allowed **Uhl- Higgins's** to facilitate identification of variant of a name

by scanning the list of name elements until it finds a name element with a high confidence score as suggested by **Byrd at** (col. col. 4, lines 9-11 and 15-18).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, **Uhl** further teaches wherein the at least one processor is equipped to determine that the address data are new if the comparison scores are relatively low and the quality rating is relatively high (col. 5, lines 6-14; col. 6, lines 53-55; col. 10, lines 60-64).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, **Uhl** further teaches wherein the at least one processor is equipped to determine that the address data are known (i.e., correct address) if the comparison scores are relatively high and the quality rating is relatively high (col. 9, lines 59-65).

Regarding claims 8, 10, 20, and 22, **Uhl** further teaches wherein the at least one processor is equipped to determined that the address data are unknown if the comparison scores are relatively low and the quality rating is relatively low (col. 2, lines 14-18 and col. 9, lines 6-17).

Regarding claims 9 and 21, **Uhl** further teaches wherein the at least one processor is equipped to generate an additional address record, containing the address data, in the address database if the address data are new (col. 2, lines 20-22).

6.　　Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Uhl et al.** ("Uhl") (U.S. Patent 6,292,709 B1) in view of **Higgins et al.** ("Higgins")(US 5,754,671 A) as applied to claims 1-4, 12, 13-16, and 24-26, further in view of **Cianfrocca et al. ("Cianfrocca")** (US 6,088,796 A)

Regarding claims 11 and 23, **Uhl** further teaches wherein data stored in the central database can be processed only via predefined rules or some of the data stored in the central database can be accessed via an output routine (col.10, lines 52-59).

Uhl and Higgins do not explicitly teach the address database is stored with security and can be accessed via a secure output routine.

Cianfrocca, however, teaches the database is stored with security and can be accessed via a secure output routine as an outside user has no ability to circumvent the system and gain access to the application server and database management system from outside the fire wall (col. 7, lines 21-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Cianfrocca's** teaching would have allowed **Uhl-Higgins's** to provide a higher level of security than was previously available in connection with efforts to make unauthorized changes to the systems by dedicating pathway or port through the firewall as suggested by **Cianfrocca** at col. 7, lines 30-37.

Response to Argument

7.　　Applicants' arguments filed 08 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that UHL does not disclose anything about "updating" at all.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that UHL teaches "updating database" as in order to improve the reading result, context information is used for the subsequent dictionary comparison. The dictionary contains all address information up to the individual delivery location. Further, UHL teaches all possible, correct and different spellings of the addresses are stored in the dictionary as well as in the forwarding data bank, so as to ensure the highest possible recognition rate (col. 5, lines 50-62). In addition, the sender address and the new, as well as the old recipient address of each return mail are entered into the data bank (i.e., updating) (col. 6, lines 53-55). Hence. UHL teaches the limitation as claimed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory

action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4120.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-

217-9197 (toll-free).

Leslie Wong
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2167

LW
September 26, 2005